DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 118 671 UD 015 697

TITLE Shared Accountability: A Pilot Program for Improving Education in the District of Columbia Public Schools through Community and Professional Involvement.
INSTITUTION District of Columbia Public Schools, Washington, D.C. Dept. of Research and Evaluation.
PUB DATE Jun 75
NOTE 38p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage
DESCRIPTORS *Community Involvement; *Educational Accountability; Educational Assessment; Educational Development; Educational Improvement; Management by Objectives; *Pilot Projects; *Professional Personnel; Program Development; Program Effectiveness; *Public Schools
IDENTIFIERS District of Columbia

ABSTRACT

The goals of this project are to assist schools in developing community ranked educational goals, to assess needs (i.e., to determine how well community ranked educational goals are being met), and to determine who among a number of groups are responsible for carrying out the goals as viewed from the local schools level. The concept of shared accountability used is considered to imply a willingness of the parties involved to go on record as to their respective impact on responsibility for the learning process and student success. The search for materials and techniques to be used in developing the model program, along with site selection and arrangements for implementation are reviewed. Implementation of the program is examined in terms of three parts corresponding to the goals. Each part describes the process of implementing the results and possible uses of data. Valuable experience and information is held to have been gained from the process of implementation itself and also new insights into the uses of the process. It is shown that the process of implementation encourages participation within the school/community, and that it creates a momentum which can be channeled into followup activities such as a management plan to develop more efficient utilization of resources. Several tables and appendices accompany the report. (Author/AM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

UD015697

ED118671

SHARED ACCOUNTABILITY: A PILOT PROGRAM FOR IMPROVING EDUCATION IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA PUBLIC SCHOOLS THROUGH COMMUNITY AND PROFESSIONAL INVOLVEMENT

UD

U S DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

UD 015 697

Prepared by

Division of Research and Evaluation
Office of Planning, Research, and Evaluation

SHARED ACCOUNTABILITY: A Pilot Program for Improving Education in the District of Columbia Public Schools Through Community and Professional Involvement.

Public Schools of the District of Columbia

Superintendent of Schools	Ms. Barbara A. Sizemore
Regional Superintendent, Region II	Dr. Dorothy L. Johnson
Assistant Superintendent for Research and Evaluation	Dr. Mildred P. Cooper
Assistant for Long Range Planning	Mr. Roger J. Fish
Associate for Research and Planning	Ms. Veta Harrison
Typist	Ms. Donna G. Green

Phi Delta Kappa Training Center

Consultant	Dr. David A. Erlandson Queens College City University of New York

Janney Elementary School

Principal	Ms. Harriet Murphy
President, Home and School Association, 1974-1975	Ms. Prudence Lake
Second Vice President, Home and School Association, 1974-1975	Ms. Elizabeth Bullock

SHARED ACCOUNTABILITY: A Pilot Program for Improving Education in the District of Columbia Public Schools Through Community and Professional Involvement.

CONTENTS

		Page
List of Tables		ii
Chapters		
I.	BACKGROUND TO THE SHARED ACCOUNTABILITY PROJECT	1
II.	PLANNING AND DEVELOPING A SHARED ACCOUNTABILITY MODEL FOR LOCAL USE	2
	Literature and Product Review	2
	Site Selection and Arrangements for Implementation	3
III.	IMPLEMENTATION OF MODEL PROGRAM	4
	Part I: Determine Goals and Priorities	4
	Part II: Needs Assessment	10
	Part III: Determining Who Is Responsible For Student Learning And Success In School	16
IV.	CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTED USE OF DATA	25
Appendices		
A.	Kappans Ponder the Goals of Education	27
B.	Goal Setting Display Board	31
C.	A Questionnaire To Determine Who Is Responsible For What In Public Education	32
D.	A Comparison Of Local School Goals In Rank Order And The Rated Importance Of Each Goal Determined By A Representative School/Community Committee, June 1975	33

Financed by funds provided under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, Title V, Part C (Public Law 89-10) as a part of the Mid-Atlantic Interstate Projects, 1975.

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
I.	Educational Goals	7
II.	Total Summary Sheet	8
III.	Goals In Rank Order	9
IV.	Individual Rating Of The Level Of Performance Of Current School Programs - Mean Scores	13
V.	Percent Of The Group Categorizing How Each Goal Is Being Met By Assessment Strata	14
VI.	Results Of The Individual Rating Of The Level Of Performance Of Current School Programs For Each Goal Showing Rank, Mean Score And Interpretation Of Score	15
VII.	Level Of Responsibility For Attaining Local School Goals By Goal And By Group As Determined By A Representative School/Community Committee, June 1975	18
VIII.	Average Responsibility For Attaining Local School Goals As Determined By A Representative School/Community Committee, June 1975	19
IX.	Level Of Responsibility For Attaining The First Ranked Local School Goal As Determined By A Representative School/Community Committee, June 1975	20
X.	Level Of Responsibility For Attaining The Second Ranked Local School Goal As Determined By A Representative School/Community Committee, June 1975	21
XI.	Level Of Responsibility For Attaining The Third Ranked Local School Goal As Determined By A Representative School/Community Committee, June 1975	22
XII.	Level Of Responsibility For Attaining The Fourth Ranked Local School Goal As Determined By A Representative School/Community Committee, June 1975	23
XIII.	Level Of Responsibility For Attaining The Fifth Ranked Local School Goal As Determined By A Representative School/Community Committee, June 1975	24

I. BACKGROUND TO THE SHARED ACCOUNTABILITY PROJECT

The Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation has represented the District of Columbia in the Mid-Atlantic Interstate Project since 1968. The project, funded under ESEA, Title V, Section 505 includes as participants the District of Columbia, Kentucky, Maryland, North Carolina, Virginia and West Virginia.

Conceptually, the overall goal of the project, as outlined in the Phase I report, is to foster mutual acceptance of shared responsibilities for public education in each state. The belief is that every student has the right to succeed and that the schools have the responsibility to provide the opportunity. Although the schools have the responsibility, a number of agencies and groups have an impact on the success of students. These groups include the students themselves, parents, administrators, teachers, Boards of Education, legislatures, and others. The term "accountability" as typically used implies performance evaluation of one or more of these parties. In contrast, the concept of "shared accountability" used in this project implies a willingness of the parties involved to go on record as to their respective impact on responsibility for the learning process and student success.

The 1974-1975 phase of the project was devoted to the development of a specific process form of accountability in each state. Following developmental and preparatory aspects of the Project, implementation of the "Shared Accountability" in one of the Regions in the D.C. Public Schools was successfully carried out in 1975.

The goals of the project were 1) to assist schools to develop community ranked education goals 2) to assess needs, i.e. determine how well community ranked educational goals were being met, and 3) to determine who among a number of groups, are responsible for carrying out the goals as viewed from the local school level.

Parents, the administrators, citizens, teachers, and students joined with representatives of the Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, D.C. Public Schools, in the implementation of a model program for community and professional development in this three-part shared accountability project.

II. PLANNING AND DEVELOPING A SHARED ACCOUNTABILITY MODEL FOR LOCAL USE

In the Fall of 1974, the Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation began a search for materials and techniques which could be helpful in developing a model program for shared accountability. The following section describes the results of this search:

Literature and Product Review:

A search begun in Fall 1974 resulted in a number of worthwhile discoveries of value to the project. Included among these were, of course, the Shared Accountability Model developed by the Interstate Project and individual approaches developed by participating member states, notably, the State of North Carolina. Other approaches investigated included the Center for the Study of Evaluation (CSE), Elementary School Evaluation Kit: Needs Assessment, which was ordered and reviewed on a 30 day free trial examination basis.

Another approach of special interest was the School Program Bonanza Game described in the November 1973 issue of Nation's Schools. Materials were secured from the developer and examined. Various materials on Management By Objectives (MBO) were reviewed including materials from Fairfax County Public Schools, D.C. Public Schools and Croft Educational Services.

Finally, materials developed by the Program Development Center at the California State University, Chico and distributed by Phi Delta Kappa were examined.

The materials disseminated by Phi Delta Kappa are entitled Educational Goals and Objectives: A Model Program for Community and Professional Involvement. These materials have been field tested in small and large school districts, in rural and urban areas, in homogeneous and heterogeneous communities and at all school levels.

As of 1973, over 5,000 educators have attended 100 workshops, and over 30,000 citizens, 16,000 professionals, and 40,000 students participated in the discussion and ranking of the aims of formal schooling. (See Appendix A) A complementary workshop packet was examined. Previous experience with this particular approach plus a number of other criteria including ease of administration, availability of technical assistance, past record of use, appropriateness to all school levels, and its dissemination by a recognized national education group like Phi Delta Kappa were factors in the selection of this model over other approaches.

Site Selection and Arrangements for Implementation:

Consideration of a site for the testing of the model was given in meetings with school administration. Due to interest shown, a meeting was held with the Regional Superintendent and Deputy Superintendent of Region II by the Assistant Superintendent of Research and Evaluation and staff to discuss Region II's involvement in the pilot. Permission was granted by the Superintendent of Region II to approach several schools. An introductory meeting took place with five school principals or their assistants present. There were three elementary, one junior high and one senior high school represented in addition to the Regional Superintendent. Responses were favorable to the presentation and to the concept, however, difficulties encountered due to a multiplicity of activities and priorities prevented active participation on the part of most schools. Meetings were, however, arranged and carried out with the principals of one elementary school and one junior high school. Visits to the schools, to explain the program in greater detail, resulted, in the case of the elementary school, in a referral to the President of Home and School Association.

The President of the Home and School Association, after consulting with the Principal and other Home and School Association officials, authorized the implementation of the model program for shared accountability in the elementary school.1/ The Second Vice President and Chairperson of the Budget and Finance Committee was assigned to work with representatives of the Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation in scheduling and making other arrangements for the program. Two meetings were scheduled to take place at the school--the first on June 5, 1975 at 3 p.m. and the second on June 10, 1975 also at 3 p.m. The Home and School Association made arrangements to establish a representative school/community group with which to work. A group of 10-15 people was agreed upon as sufficient for the exercise. Members of this group included parents, students, teachers, the principal and other community.

The Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation agreed to provide materials for the exercise, an expert consultant to assist in implementing the goal setting exercise, and to produce a final report for the school and community.

Actual implementation involved three parts: 1) a goal setting and ranking exercise, 2) a needs assessment, and 3) the determination of (shared) responsibilities for attaining these goals. The results of these three activities are described in the following section.

1/ A report on developments at the junior high school will be the subject of a later report.

III. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MODEL PROGRAM

As mentioned earlier, the goals of the Shared Accountability Project were 1) to assist schools to develop community ranked educational goals, 2) to assess the current level of performance, and 3) to determine shared accountability for each goal. The implementation was divided into three corresponding parts. Each part describes the process of implementating the results and possible uses of data.

Part I: Determine Goals and Priorities

On June 5, 1975 representatives of the elementary school/community joined with representatives of the Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, D.C. Public Schools, to determine school goals and priorities. Representing the school at this first meeting were 17 individuals, five teachers, nine parents and three sixth graders.

Mr. Roger J. Fish of the Division of Research and Evaluation, assisted by Mrs. Veta Harrison of the same office, explained the purpose of the overall project including a brief description of planned activities. Session one's major activity involved the implementation of Phi Delta Kappa's model program for community and professional involvement. This activity was carried out by Dr. David A. Erlandson, School of Education, Queens College, City University of New York. Dr. Erlandson was asked to assist because of his extensive experience in implementing this program for Phi Delta Kappa. (See Appendix B)

The 18 goals used in this program were derived from the 18 goal categories developed in 1969 by the California School Boards Association. This list was completed after a thorough analysis of goals from other states, pilot schools of California's Planning, Program, Budgeting System, and other sources. The research indicated the 18 goal categories of the California School Boards Association were all-encompassing and acceptable as a starting point for most citizens of the community. From the many field tests which have been conducted using these 18 goals, it has been found community members rarely suggest additional goals and the 18 goals are accepted as legitimate aims of educational institutions. Copies of these 18 goals were distributed to each person present and reviewed in detail.

As part of his helping role, Dr. Erlandson assisted in revising the list of educational goals. Five alterations, changes or additions were made by the committee to four of the eighteen goals. These changes were as follows:

Goal: Develop skills in reading, writing, speaking and listening.

Addition: C. Develop skills in using and understanding communication media.

Goal: Understand and practice democratic ideas and ideals.

Addition: E. Develop understanding and appreciation of cultural pluralism in American society and American democratic values in the context of other people values.

Goal: Learn how to examine and use information.

Addition: E. Develop ability to use mathematical concepts, symbols and processes.

Goal: Practice and understand the ideas of health and safety.

Addition: E. Protect, maintain and improve his physical and mental health and social and emotional adjustment.

A final list of revised educational goals was agreed upon and may be seen in Table I. After the orientation and the revision of the list of goals, members of the school/community committee proceeded to independently rank in priority order the 18 revised educational goals. Each committee member had an individual display board, a set of 18 goal statements and 45 red discs. Each committee member then ranked in order of their importance the goals on the display board. As each individual completed his display board, the score of each goal (1-5) was transferred to an individual goal summary sheet. A portion of a display board with discs in place may be found in Appendix C.

Following the individual ranking exercise, committee members were randomly assigned in groups of four. The task of each small group was to reach a group consensus or agreement on our display board for the 18 goals. After a group concensus was reached, the scores were tallied by each small group on a "group summary sheet". Each group turned over this group report to the consultant who transferred data from each report to a "total summary sheet". The consultant then computed group totals, means, ranks and variances for each goal. The results of this may be seen in Table II. The column on the far right lists the variance or the amount of agreement or disagreement among groups A-E relative to the importance of each goal. Items range from .16 to 2.00. Note, that the smaller the number the greater the agreement; the larger the number, the greater the disagreement.

The goals with the greatest amount of agreement among groups A-E show a variance of .16 in the column at the right. Those goals with variances of .96, 1.04 and 2.00 are also the goals where the greatest amount of disagreement exists. No goal has a variance of 0.00 (complete agreement) but one goal has a variance of 2.00. While the variance does not identify the cause or reason for disagreement, it may be used to identify goal areas where disagreement does exists. This knowledge can

be most helpful to the school principal, Home and School Association, curriculum and staff development coordinator and others interested or involved in local school problem solving.

An additional application of the data on the "Total Summary Sheet" is the production of a list of local school goals in rank or priority order as shown in Table III. A fuller understanding of each goal requires a review of the sub-items found in Table I. The reader should observe the additions made by the representative school/community committee to the goal list. Note that additions occurred in the first and second ranked goals as well as in the seventh and one of the thirteenth ranked goals. Reference to Table II where the variance is shown, points out goal areas where there is group unity or disunity over selected goals. All three tables are the product of the first meeting and all three help define and illuminate local schools goals.

What is to be done with this information? At the present time, this is at the option of the local school. As suggested by Phi Delta Kappa, this, coupled with the results of the needs assessment leads directly into curriculum and instructional revision or improvements. It can also be used to plan school programs and budget for the coming school year; for guiding staff development activities; as a focus for Home and School Association activities and as a standard against which to measure current school performance. Such a needs assessment is precisely the next step of the Shared Accountability Project.

TABLE I

EDUCATIONAL GOALS

* These are not in any order of importance.

EDUCATIONAL GOALS SET BY THE JANNEY ELEMENTARY SCHOOL, JUNE 5, 1975

LEARN HOW TO BE A GOOD CITIZEN
A. Develop an awareness of civic rights and responsibilities.
B. Develop attitudes for productive citizenship in a democracy.
C. Develop an attitude of respect for personal and public property.
D. Develop an understanding of the obligations and responsibilities of citizenship.

LEARN HOW TO RESPECT AND GET ALONG WITH PEOPLE WHO THINK, DRESS AND ACT DIFFERENTLY
A. Develop an appreciation for and an understanding of other people and other cultures.
B. Develop an understanding of political, economic, and social patterns of the rest of the world.
C. Develop awareness of the interdependence of races, creeds, nations and cultures.
D. Develop an awareness of the processes of group relationships.

LEARN ABOUT AND TRY TO UNDERSTAND THE CHANGES THAT TAKE PLACE IN THE WORLD
A. Develop ability to adjust to the changing demands of society.
B. Develop an awareness and the ability to adjust to a changing world and its problems.
C. Develop understanding of the past, identify with the present, and the ability to meet the future.

DEVELOP SKILLS IN READING, WRITING, SPEAKING AND LISTENING
A. Develop ability to communicate ideas and feelings effectively.
B. Develop skills in oral and written English.

*C. Develop skills in using and understanding communication media.

UNDERSTAND AND PRACTICE DEMOCRATIC IDEAS AND IDEALS
A. Develop loyalty to American democratic ideals.
B. Develop satisfaction and loyalty to ideas of democracy.
C. Develop knowledge and appreciation of the rights and privileges in our democracy.
D. Develop an understanding of our American heritage.

*E. Develop understanding and appreciation of of cultural pluralism in American society and American democratic values in the context of other peoples values.

LEARN HOW TO EXAMINE AND USE INFORMATION
A. Develop ability to examine constructively and creatively.
B. Develop ability to use scientific methods.
C. Develop reasoning abilities.
D. Develop skills to think and process logically.

*E. Develop ability to use mathematical concepts, symbols and process.

*F. Develop ability to use community resources.

UNDERSTAND AND PRACTICE THE SKILLS OF FAMILY LIVING
A. Develop understanding and appreciation of the principles of living in the family group.
B. Develop attitudes leading to acceptance of responsibilities as family members.
C. Develop an awareness of future family responsibilities and achievement of skills in preparing to accept them.

LEARN TO RESPECT AND GET ALONG WITH PEOPLE WITH WHOM WE WORK AND LIVE
A. Develop appreciation and respect for the worth and dignity of individuals.
B. Develop respect for individual worth and understanding of minority opinions and acceptance of majority decisions.
C. Develop a cooperative attitude toward living and working with others.

DEVELOP SKILLS TO ENTER A SPECIFIC FIELD OF WORK
A. Develop abilities and skills needed for immediate employment.
B. Develop an awareness of opportunities and requirements related to a specific field of work.
C. Develop an appreciation of good workmanship.

LEARN HOW TO BE A GOOD MANAGER OF MONEY, PROPERTY AND RESOURCES
A. Develop an understanding of economic principles and responsibilities.
B. Develop ability and understanding in personal buying, selling and investment.
C. Develop skills in management of natural and human resources and man's environment.

DEVELOP A DESIRE FOR LEARNING NOW AND IN THE FUTURE
A. Develop intellectual curiosity and eagerness for lifelong learning.
B. Develop a positive attitude toward learning.
C. Develop a positive attitude toward continuing independent education.

LEARN HOW TO USE LEISURE TIME
A. Develop ability to use leisure time productively.
B. Develop a positive attitude toward participation in a range of leisure time activities—physical, intellectual and creative.
C. Develop appreciation and interests which will lead to wise and enjoyable use of leisure time.

PRACTICE AND UNDERSTAND THE IDEAS OF HEALTH AND SAFETY
A. Establish an effective individual physical fitness program.
B. Develop an understanding of good physical health and well being.
C. Establish sound personal health habits and information.
D. Develop a concern for public health and safety.

*E. Protect, maintain and improve his physical and mental health and his social and emotional adjustment.

APPRECIATE CULTURE AND BEAUTY IN THE WORLD
A. Develop abilities for effective expression of ideas and cultural appreciation (fine arts).
B. Cultivate appreciation for beauty in various forms.
C. Develop creative self-expression through various media (art, music, writing, etc.).
D. Develop special talents in music, art, literature and foreign languages.

GAIN INFORMATION NEEDED TO MAKE JOB SELECTIONS
A. Promote self-understanding and self-direction in relation to student's occupational interests.
B. Develop the ability to use information and counseling services related to the selection of a job.
C. Develop a knowledge of specific information about a particular vocation.

DEVELOP PRIDE IN WORK AND A FEELING OF SELF-WORTH
A. Develop a feeling of student pride in his achievements and progress.
B. Develop self-understanding and self-awareness.
C. Develop the student's feeling of positive self-worth, security, and self-assurance.

DEVELOP GOOD CHARACTER AND SELF-RESPECT
A. Develop moral responsibility and a sound ethical and moral behavior.
B. Develop the student's capacity to discipline himself to work, study, and play constructively.
C. Develop a moral and ethical sense of values, goals, and processes of free society.
D. Develop standards of personal character and ideas.

GAIN A GENERAL EDUCATION
A. Develop background and skills in the use of language, natural sciences, mathematics, and social sciences.
B. Develop a fund of information and concepts.
C. Develop special interests and abilities.

* = Alterations, changes or additions to goals made by the representative goal setting committee.

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES
TOTAL SUMMARY SHEET

GOALS	GROUP SCORES A	B	C	D	E	TOTAL	AVG.	RANK	S^2*
Learn how to be a good citizen	2	3	2	2	3	12	2.4	12	.24
Learn how to respect and get along with people who think, dress and act differently	4	2	3	2	3	14	2.8	8	.56
Learn about and try to understand the changes that take place in the world	3	3	4	2	2	14	2.8	8	.56
Develop skills in reading, writing, speaking, and listening	4	4	5	5	5	23	4.6	1	.24
Understand and practice democratic ideas and ideals	2	2	1	2	2	9	1.8	13	.16
Learn how to examine and use information	3	4	4	4	5	20	4.0	2	.40
Understand and practice the skills of family living	1	1	0	1	1	4	.8	16	.16
Learn to respect and get along with people with whom we work and live	3	4	3	4	3	17	3.4	5	.24
Develop skills to enter a specific field of work	1	0	0	0	0	1	.2	17	.16
Learn how to be a good manager of money, property and resources	2	2	0	2	1	7	1.4	15	.64
Develop a desire for learning now and in the future	3	4	5	4	2	18	3.6	4	1.04
Learn how to use leisure time	2	1	2	2	2	9	1.8	13	.16
Practice and understand the ideas of health and safety	2	3	1	4	5	15	3.0	7	2.00
Appreciate culture and beauty in the world	3	2	3	4	1	13	2.6	11	1.04
Gain information needed to make job selections	1	0	0	0	0	1	.2	17	.16
Develop pride in work and a feeling of self-worth	4	4	5	2	4	19	3.8	3	.96
Develop good character and self-respect	3	4	3	3	3	16	3.2	6	.16
Gain a general education	3	2	4	2	3	14	2.8	8	.56

*S^2 equals Estimate of Population Variance. Items range from .16 to 2.00. The smaller the number in this column, the greater the agreement among groups relative to the importance of a particular goal; the larger the number, the greater the disagreement.

TABLE III

GOALS IN RANK ORDER

Rank Order of Goals and Objectives, Phi Delta Kappa Model Program for Community and Professional Involvement, Implemented at the Janney Elementary School, June 5, 1975

Rank	Goals
1	*Develop skills in reading, writing, speaking, and listening
2	*Learn how to examine and use information
3	Develop pride in work and a feeling of self-worth
4	Develop a desire for learning now and in the future
5	Learn to respect and get along with people with whom we work and live
6	Develop good character and self-respect
7	*Practice and understand the ideas of health and safety
8	Learn how to respect and get along with people who think, dress and act differently
8	Learn about and try to understand the changes that take place in the world
8	Gain a general education
11	Appreciate culture and beauty in the world
12	Learn how to be a good citizen
13	*Understand and practice democratic ideas and ideals
13	Learn how to use leisure time
15	Learn how to be a good manager of money, property and resources
16	Understand and practice the skills of family living
17	Develop skills to enter a specific field of work
17	Gain information needed to make job selections

*Sub-goals were added by the representative School/Community Committee to each of the goals preceeded by an asterish. For details refer to Table I of this report.

Prepared by
Division of Research and Evaluation
June 9, 1975

Part II: Needs Assessment

At the end of the first meeting with the school/community on June 5, 1975 a questionnaire from the Phi Delta Kappa model program for community and professional involvement package was distributed. The questionnaire entitled, "Individual Rating of the Level of Performance of Current School Programs" was given out with instructions that it should be completed at home and returned at the next scheduled meeting. Participants were encouraged to discuss it with friends before completing it. The purpose of this needs assessment exercise was to help determine how well current programs were meeting school goals.

Fourteen completed questionnaires were collected at the second meeting on June 10. On the basis of data collected, the mean assessment of perceived needs by this community group was computed. This was done in the standard way by totaling the scores given by each participant on each goal statement and dividing by the number of participants. Five strata are used in this subjective needs instrument:

Strata	Score Range
Extremely poor	1-3
Poor	4-6
Fair but more needs to be done	7-9
Leave as is	10-12
Too much is being done	13-15

When reading individual goal statements, each person was instructed to ask themselves "How well are current programs meeting this goal?" An interpretation of each of the five strata mentioned above was provided along with the instructions as follows:

> EXTREMELY POOR means: I believe students are not being taught the skills necessary to meet this goal. This goal is the school's responsibility but almost nothing is being done to meet this goal.
>
> POOR means: I believe programs designed to meet this goal are weak. I believe that much more effort must be made by the school to meet this goal.
>
> FAIR BUT MORE NEEDS TO BE DONE means: I believe present programs are acceptable, but I would like to see more importance attached to this goal by the school. I would rate the school's job in this area as only fair; more effort is needed as far as I am concerned.
>
> LEAVE AS IS means: I believe the school is doing a good job in meeting this goal. I am satisfied with the present programs which are designed to meet this goal.

TOO MUCH IS BEING DONE means: I believe the school is already spending too much time in this area. I believe programs in this area are not the responsibility of the school.

FOR EXAMPLE:

If one believed that the goal "Learn How To Be A Good Citizen" is being met quite adequately, a circle would be drawn around the appropriate number on the scale. The circled number would then be place in the score box.

EXTREMELY POOR			POOR			FAIR BUT MORE NEEDS TO BE DONE			LEAVE AS IS			TOO MUCH IS BEING DONE			Score
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	(11)	12	13	14	15	11

Three tables are included in the following pages. Two of these tables display a mean score. In interpreting the mean score, Phi Delta Kappa states that an average mean score of 6 or below indicates that the school apparently is not meeting the expectations of the group responding very well. A score between 7 and 9 means the school is doing all right but that more needs to be done. A score between 9 and 12 means the school is on target (is meeting the needs of the community). A mean score above 12 indicates that the group believes the school is placing more emphasis on the goal than necessary.

Looking at the actual mean scores (Table IV) one can see that at this school all scores were 9.0 or above. No mean scores were lower than 9 and no scores above 12 appeared, underscoring a general satisfaction that school needs are being met.

Table V is somewhat more helpful in interpreting the results of the needs assessment. On this table a percentage has been computed showing how the group participating in the needs assessment categorized each goal by the five assessment strata. As can be seen by looking at Table V, seven percent of those responding to goal 11, "Develop a desire for learning now and in the future," categorized its status as extremely poor (students are not being taught enough to meet this goal). Fourteen percent categorized it as "poor", thirty-six percent as "fair but more needs to be done," while forty-three percent say "Leave as is."

Goals 1, 5, and 7 in Table V show a high level of satisfaction with the achievement of this goal, each receiving a rating of 86 percent in the "leave as is category." Goals 9 and 15 on the other hand, show fourteen percent and twenty-one percent respectively as saying that "too much is being done." This categorization may suggest areas to reduce emphasis or cut back resources. Goals 4, 16, and 17 each show a fifty percent or higher rating of "fair but more needs to be done." These and other goals with slightly lower ratings in the "fair" category indicate that a relatively large group feels more attention should be paid to the improvement of these goals.

Table VI shows goals in rank order with corresponding mean scores and interpretations of the score. This table lists the goals in order of priority as determined by the representative school/community committee. In studying Table VI, the principal or Home and School Association may wish to focus attention on the highest ranked goals--for example, the top five. In this case, the fifth ranked goal appears to be receiving enough attention. The first through fourth ranked goals all have scores between nine and ten. These are satisfactory scores according to Phi Delta Kappa but show the concern of the community that efforts be renewed, or continued, to focus attention on their improvement.

Another application of these tables, might be their use to stimulate discussion in the community as to why certain ratings were given or what needs to be done specifically to improve achievement or raise the level of satisfaction of a specific goal or of the overall program.

Finally, in reviewing these tables and any apparent deficiencies, it is important to note the overall favorable picture of a school on target programatically and meeting the needs of the community. The deficiencies, such as they are, are relatively minor. In practical terms they are indicators which suggest areas where adjustments may be needed, and where the principal, teachers, students, parents, and others may focus their attention in improving the educational program.

TABLE IV

INDIVIDUAL RATING OF THE LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE
OF CURRENT SCHOOL PROGRAMS - MEAN SCORES*

GOALS AND OBJECTIVES

A MODEL PROGRAM FOR COMMUNITY AND PROFESSIONAL INVOLVEMENT

June 1975

SCHOOL Janney Elementary

	GOALS (Not in order of importance)	MEAN SCORE
1.	LEARN HOW TO BE A GOOD CITIZEN	10.8
2.	LEARN HOW TO RESPECT AND GET ALONG WITH PEOPLE WHO THINK, DRESS AND ACT DIFFERENTLY	10.2
3.	LEARN ABOUT AND TRY TO UNDERSTAND THE CHANGES THAT TAKE PLACE IN THE WORLD	9.4
4.	DEVELOP SKILLS IN READING, WRITING, SPEAKING, AND LISTENING	9.3
5.	UNDERSTAND AND PRACTICE DEMOCRATIC IDEAS AND IDEALS	10.5
6.	LEARN HOW TO EXAMINE AND USE INFORMATION	9.4
7.	UNDERSTAND AND PRACTICE THE SKILLS OF FAMILY LIVING	11.4
8.	LEARN TO RESPECT AND GET ALONG WITH PEOPLE WITH WHOM WE WORK AND LIVE	10.2
9.	DEVELOP SKILLS TO ENTER A SPECIFIC FIELD OF WORK	11.0
10.	LEARN HOW TO BE A GOOD MANAGER OF MONEY, PROPERTY AND RESOURCES	10.2
11.	DEVELOP A DESIRE FOR LEARNING NOW AND IN THE FUTURE	9.2
12.	LEARN HOW TO USE LEISURE TIME	9.5
13.	PRACTICE AND UNDERSTAND THE IDEAS OF HEALTH AND SAFETY	9.6
14.	APPRECIATE CULTURE AND BEAUTY IN THE WORLD	9.0
15.	GAIN INFORMATION NEEDED TO MAKE JOB SELECTIONS	11.5
16.	DEVELOP PRIDE IN WORK AND A FEELING OF SELF-WORTH	9.0
17.	DEVELOP GOOD CHARACTER AND SELF-RESPECT	9.7
18.	GAIN A GENERAL EDUCATION	9.5

*This needs assessment exercise is designed to determine how well community ranked educational goals are being met.

TABLE V

PERCENT OF THE GROUP CATEGORIZING HOW EACH GOAL IS BEING MET BY ASSESSMENT STRATA

	Goal 1	Goal 2	Goal 3	Goal 4	Goal 5	Goal 6	Goal 7	Goal 8	Goal 9
Extremely poor	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Poor	0	0	14	7	0	7	0	0	0
Fair but more needs to be done	14	29	29	50	14	43	7	36	21
Leave as is	86	71	43	43	86	50	86	64	65
Too much is being done	0	0	0	0	0	0	7	0	14

	Goal 10	Goal 11	Goal 12	Goal 13	Goal 14	Goal 15	Goal 16	Goal 17	Goal 18
Extremely poor	0	7	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Poor	7	14	7	0	14	0	7	0	7
Fair but more needs to be done	29	36	36	43	36	14	57	50	36
Leave as is	57	43	57	57	50	67	36	50	57
Too much is being done	7	0	0	0	0	21	0	0	0

NOTE: On this table a percentage has been computed showing how the group participating in the needs assessment categorized each goal by the five assessment strata. This categorization may suggest areas to reduce emphasis or cut back resources; areas of general satisfaction, or may indicate that more attention should be paid to the improvement of certain goals. The order in which goals are displayed in this table follows the order as used in Table IV. The goals are not in any order of importance,

TABLE VI

RESULTS OF THE INDIVIDUAL RATING OF THE LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE OF CURRENT SCHOOL PROGRAMS FOR EACH GOAL SHOWING RANK, MEAN SCORE AND INTERPRETATION OF SCORE

Rank	Goals	Mean Score	Interpretation of Score
1	Develop skills in reading, writing, speaking, and listening	9.3	Fair but more needs to be done[1/]
2	Learn how to examine and use information	9.4	Fair but more needs to be done[1/]
3	Develop pride in work and a feeling of self-worth	9.0	Fair but more needs to be done[1/]
4	Develop a desire for learning now and in the future	9.2	Fair but more needs to be done[1/]
5	Learn to respect and get along with people with whom we work and live	10.2	Leave as is[2/]
6	Develop good character and self-respect	9.7	Fair but more needs to be done[1/]
7	Practice and understand the ideas of health and safety	9.6	Fair but more needs to be done[1/]
8	Learn how to respect and get along with people who think, dress and act differently	10.2	Leave as is[2/]
8	Learn about and try to understand the changes that take place in the world.	9.4	Fair but more needs to be done[1/]
8	Gain a general education	9.5	Fair but more needs to be done[1/]
11	Appreciate culture and beauty in the world	9.0	Fair but more needs to be done[1/]
12	Learn how to be a good citizen	10.8	Leave as is[2/]
13	Learn how to use leisure time	9.5	Fair but more needs to be done[1/]
13	Understand and practice democratic ideas and ideals	10.5	Leave as is[2/]
15	Learn how to be a good manager of money, property and resources	10.2	Leave as is[2/]
16	Understand and practice the skills of family living	11.4	Leave as is[2/]
17	Develop skills to enter a specific field of work	11.0	Leave as is[2/]
17	Gain information needed to make job selections	11.5	Leave as is[2/]

NOTE: According to Phi Delta Kappa, an average mean score of 6 or below indicates the school apparently is not meeting the expectations of the group responding very well. A score between 6 and 9 means the school is doing alright but more needs to be done. A score between 9 and 12 means the school is on target (is meeting the needs of the community). A mean score above 12 indicates that the group believes the school is placing more emphasis on the goal than necessary.

1/ FAIR BUT MORE NEEDS TO BE DONE means: "I believe present programs are acceptable, but would like to see more importance attached to this goal by the school", or "I would rate the school's job in this area as only fair; more effort is needed as far as I am concerned".

2/ LEAVE AS IS means: "I believe the school is doing a good job in meeting this goal", or "I am satisfied with the present programs which are designed to meet this goal".

Part III: Determining Who Is Responsible For Student Learning and Success In School

As indicated earlier, the goal setting exercise was carried out on June 5, 1975. Less than a week later, on June 10, a second session was held at the school. The purpose of the meeting was 1) to determine the importance of each goal and 2) to determine who among a number of groups, were responsible for carrying out the goals as viewed from the local school level. An instrument developed by the Division of Research and Evaluation was utilized for that purpose. The following groups or categories having responsibility for attaining the goals were included on the instrument:

1. Parents
2. Teachers
3. Students
4. Principals
5. Central Administration
6. Regional Administration
7. School Board
8. City Government
9. Congress
10. Other Citizens

Parents, teachers, students and principals were selected because they form the basis of the local school unit; the Board of Education because it sets school policy; central and regional administration because the school structure was decentralized in July 1974 and because each has an impact and influence on each school; the city government (Mayor and City Council) because the school system is an agency of the District Government; Congress because that body exercises control over the city and school system budget, and other citizens because resident tax paying adults with or without children in the school system have a right to be heard and involved in local school planning.

Each of these categories or groups impacts on the attainment of school goals to some extent. This second exercise was designed to have a representative school/community committee determine the level of responsibility of each group respective to the attainment of each school goal.

Additionally, the committee determined the relative importance of each goal through a rating process. Data from this rating is included in the report for purpose of comparison with the results of session one. However, this data element will be eliminated from the instrument as a result of this pilot because a prioritized list of goals was accomplished in the first session and, except for verification, a second list is of little additional use. The instruction sheet and sample question for the shared accountability instrument are shown in Appendix D.

An orientation in the use of the shared accountability instrument was provided by two representatives of the Division of Research and Evaluation to the twelve participants of the second session. After the orientation, each individual present proceeded to rate each goal in importance and determine the degree each group is responsible for attaining each goal.

Following completion of the "individual rating sheet", committee members were randomly assigned in groups of three (groups of four or five would also be acceptable). The task of each small group was to reach a concensus or agreement on each goal's importance and the level of responsibility of each group. After a group concensus was reached, the scores were tallied on a "group summary sheet" and presented to the representatives of the Division of Research and Evaluation for analysis.

The outcome of this analysis was a determination of 1) the relative importance of each goal, and 2) the level of responsibility assigned to each group in attaining the goal. The complete data on the goal rating exercises may be found in Appendix E. Despite the fact that five days elapsed between the administration of the two exercises, one can see that the results of the second tend to verify the results of the first. Differences in rating do occur in goals two, seven and one of those identified in number eight (gain a general education) but these are relatively minor. As mentioned earlier, a direct result of this pilot will be the elimination of the second goal rating component from the shared accountability instrument as repetitious. The more important second goal, determining responsibility, will be retained.

Table VII shows the level of responsibility for attaining local school goals for each group. The goals are shown in rank order (order of importance) as determined in session one. To the right of each goal are numbers which, when read in connection with a particular group, yields the level of responsibility assigned by the school/community committee to the group for attaining the goal. A score of 5 or 5.0 equals a very high responsibility; 4 equals a high responsibility, 3 a medium responsibility; 2 a slight responsibility, and 1 equals no responsibility. At the bottom of the table, an average level of responsibility for each group is shown.

Tables VIII - XIII analyze this table in more detail as relates to the top five ranked school goals. An average score has been computed for each goal under consideration and the scores and corresponding groups listed by level of responsibility from highest to lowest. A mean score is also shown. Those groups which fall above the mean can be said to have the greater responsibility for attaining the specific goal; those below, lesser responsibility.

TABLE VII

LEVEL OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR ATTAINING LOCAL SCHOOL GOALS BY GOAL AND BY GROUP AS DETERMINED BY A REPRESENTATIVE SCHOOL/COMMUNITY COMMITTEE, JUNE 1975

GOALS IN RANK ORDER	Responsible Groups and Assigned Levels of Responsibility*									
	Principals	Students	Congress	Board	School Administrators	Regional Administrators	Central Administrators	Teachers	Parents	Citizens	City Government
1. DEVELOP SKILLS IN READING, WRITING, SPEAKING AND LISTENING.	3.9	3.8	2.8	4.1	3.3	3.8	5.0	4.3	3.2	3.1
2. LEARN HOW TO EXAMINE AND USE INFORMATION.	3.6	4.1	2.8	3.5	2.9	3.1	5.0	4.5	2.2	2.8
3. DEVELOP PRIDE IN WORK AND A FEELING OF SELF-WORTH.	4.7	4.4	2.1	2.3	2.3	2.5	5.0	4.9	3.1	2.1
4. DEVELOP A DESIRE FOR LEARNING NOW AND IN THE FUTURE.	4.3	4.4	2.3	2.9	3.3	3.7	4.7	4.8	2.9	2.8
5. LEARN TO RESPECT AND GET ALONG WITH PEOPLE WITH WHOM WE WORK AND LIVE.	4.8	4.7	2.3	3.1	2.8	3.0	4.9	4.9	3.8	2.6
6. DEVELOP GOOD CHARACTER AND SELF-RESPECT.	4.4	4.3	2.8	2.5	2.8	3.0	4.7	5.0	3.4	2.7
7. PRACTICE AND UNDERSTAND THE IDEAS OF HEALTH AND SAFETY.	4.2	4.3	2.8	2.8	2.8	2.9	4.3	4.7	2.8	3.2
8. GAIN A GENERAL EDUCATION.	4.6	4.1	3.3	3.4	3.4	3.4	5.0	4.7	2.4	3.8
8. LEARN ABOUT AND TRY TO UNDERSTAND THE CHANGES THAT TAKE PLACE IN THE WORLD.	3.3	4.0	2.2	2.9	2.8	2.7	4.5	4.7	2.8	3.0
8. LEARN HOW TO RESPECT AND GET ALONG WITH PEOPLE WHO THINK, DRESS AND ACT DIFFERENTLY.	4.4	4.2	3.3	3.0	3.3	3.4	5.0	4.8	3.3	2.9
11. APPRECIATE CULTURE AND BEAUTY IN THE WORLD.	4.0	4.3	3.4	3.0	2.1	3.0	4.5	4.7	3.4	3.4
12. LEARN HOW TO BE A GOOD CITIZEN.	4.3	4.5	3.1	2.7	3.3	3.0	4.8	4.8	3.6	3.4
13. LEARN HOW TO USE LEISURE TIME.	3.0	4.6	2.2	1.9	1.6	1.6	3.5	4.9	2.6	2.8
13. UNDERSTAND AND PRACTICE DEMOCRATIC IDEAS AND IDEALS.	4.3	4.5	3.9	3.5	3.2	4.1	4.5	4.3	3.3	3.6
15. LEARN HOW TO BE A GOOD MANAGER OF MONEY, PROPERTY AND RESOURCES.	2.7	3.5	3.3	2.8	2.1	2.7	3.3	4.2	2.9	2.5
16. UNDERSTAND AND PRACTICE THE SKILLS OF FAMILY LIVING.	2.8	4.3	1.9	2.0	1.9	1.9	3.2	4.8	2.6	1.9
17. DEVELOP SKILLS TO ENTER A SPECIFIC FIELD OF WORK.	2.0	2.1	2.0	2.0	1.9	2.0	2.1	2.8	2.3	2.1
17. GAIN INFORMATION NEEDED TO MAKE JOB SELECTIONS.	2.6	2.8	1.8	1.8	1.8	1.8	2.3	3.1	1.9	1.7
Average Level of Responsibility for each Group	3.8	4.1	2.7	2.8	2.6	2.9	4.2	4.5	2.9	2.8

* A score of 5 = Very high responsibility; 4 = high responsibility; 3 = medium responsibility; 2 = slight responsibility; 1 = no responsibility.

TABLE VIII

AVERAGE RESPONSIBLITY FOR ATTAINING
LOCAL SCHOOL GOALS AS DETERMINED BY A REPRESENTATIVE
SCHOOL/COMMUNITY COMMITTEE, JUNE 1975

GROUP	SCORE	MEAN	LEVEL OF RESPONSIBILITY*
Parents	4.5		High
Teachers	4.2		High
Students	4.1		High
Principal	3.8	3.3	Medium
Central Administration	2.9		Slight
Other Citizens	2.9		Slight
School Board	2.8		Slight
City Government	2.8		Slight
Congress	2.7		Slight
Regional Administration	2.6		Slight

*A score of 5 = very high responsibility; 4 = high responsibility; 3 = medium responsibility; 2 = slight responsibility; 1 = no responsibility.

The above table is the result of taking an average of all the scores of each group for the eighteen goals. A mean score has been computed, (3.3). Those above the mean can be said to have, overall, the greatest responsibility for attaining local school objectives. Parents were listed above teachers, students and principals as having the highest responsibility for attaining school goals or, in other words, for student success in school. Teachers were followed closely by students and then principals in level of responsibility.

Among the groups which fall below the mean, it can be seen that a distinction exists between level of responsibility attributed to central administration and the regional administrative level. One might have expected the responsibility of the regional office to have been viewed as equal to or higher in responsibility than the central administration if only because of the geographic and administrative proximity of the regional office to the school. The results show the contrary, however. This phenomenon may be the result of the decentralization process begun in July 1974 in the D.C. Public Schools which created six regional administrative areas. The first year of this process was devoted to staffing and organization. The scores may be indicative of the fact that responsibilities of regional offices, vis-a-vis the central or state of development and are not yet clear to the community.

The school board, city government (the Mayor and City Council) and the Congress are clustered closely together as might be expected of bodies sharing responsibilities in the fiscal and policy areas. It is interesting to note that no group was assigned a score of <u>one</u>, i.e., no responsiblity.

TABLE IX

LEVEL OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR ATTAINING THE FIRST RANKED LOCAL SCHOOL GOAL AS DETERMINED BY A REPRESENTATIVE SCHOOL/COMMUNITY COMMITTEE, JUNE 1975

First Ranked School Goal:

1. Develop Skills in Reading, Writing, Speaking and Listening.

GROUP	SCORE	MEAN	LEVEL OF RESPONSIBILITY*
Teachers	5.0		Very High
Parents	4.3		High
School Board	4.1		High
Principal	3.9		Medium
Students	3.8		Medium
Central Administration	3.8		Medium
		3.7	
Regional Administration	3.3		Medium
Other Citizens	3.2		Medium
City Government	3.1		Medium
Congress	2.8		Slight

*A score of 5 = very high responsibility; 4 = high responsibility; 3 = medium responsibility; 2 = slight responsibility; 1 = no responsibility.

The above table dealing with the first ranked school goal identifies, by the location of the mean, six groups as having from very high to medium responsibility for attaining that goal. Not surprisingly, those with the technical skills to teach reading, the teachers, are listed first with a very high level of responsibility. Parents came next followed by the School Board. Perhaps the latters role is viewed here as one of supporting this important goal with resources and the prestige of the Board itself. The principal, students and central administration are next in descending order.

Below the mean, but still identified as having medium responsibility, are the regional administration, other citizens and the city government. Congress was rated lowest in level of responsibility. In spite of Congress' very real control over Public School appropriations in the District of Columbia, the community perceived the responsibility of Congress in attaining this first ranked goal as only slight.

TABLE X

LEVEL OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR ATTAINING THE SECOND RANKED LOCAL SCHOOL GOAL AS DETERMINED BY A REPRESENTATIVE SCHOOL/COMMUNITY COMMITTEE, JUNE 1975

Second Ranked School Goal:

2. Learn How to Examine and Use Information.

GROUP	SCORE	MEAN	LEVEL OF RESPONSIBILITY*
Teachers	5.0		Very High
Parents	4.5		High
Students	4.1		High
Principal	3.6		Medium
School Board	3.5	3.5	Medium
Central Administration	3.1		Medium
Regional Administration	2.9		Slight
City Government	2.8		Slight
Congress	2.8		Slight
Other Citizens	2.2		Slight

*A score of 5 = very high responsibility; 4 = high responsibility; 3 = medium responsibility; 2 = slight responsibility; 1 = no responsibility.

In the above table, six groups are shown to have from medium to very high responsibility for attaining this school goal. As in goal one, the teachers are listed first with a very high responsibility, followed by parents and students respectively both with a high level of responsibility. The principal and the School Board follow with medium levels of responsibility. The School Board, in this instance, falls on the mean. The assignment of this level of responsibility to the Board of Education underscores the importance of this goal and the desire of the community for these elected officials to support this local school goal.

Below the mean fall the central administration, regional administration, city government, Congress and other citizens in descending order. Among these, the central administration is assigned a medium level of responsibility but all others are designated with a slight level of responsibility.

TABLE XI

LEVEL OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR ATTAINING THE THIRD RANKED LOCAL SCHOOL GOAL AS DETERMINED BY A REPRESENTATIVE SCHOOL/COMMUNITY COMMITTEE, JUNE 1975

Third Ranked School Goal:

GROUP	SCORE	MEAN	LEVEL OF RESPONSIBILITY*
Teachers	5.0		Very High
Parents	4.9		High
Principals	4.7		High
Students	4.4	3.3	High
Other Citizens	3.1		Medium
Central Administration	2.5		Slight
School Board	2.3		Slight
Regional Administration	2.3		Slight
City Government	2.1		Slight
Congress	2.1		Slight

*A score of 5 = very high responsibility; 4 = high responsibility; 3 = medium responsibility; 2 = slight responsibility; 1 = no responsibility.

In achieving goal three, teachers are designated as having a very high level of responsibility in the student's development of a positive self-concept. Parents, principals and the student himself are shown to have a high responsibility.

Below the mean, all other groups are shown as having only slight responsibility except the other citizens category which is designated as medium.

TABLE XII

LEVEL OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR ATTAINING THE FOURTH RANKED LOCAL SCHOOL GOAL AS DETERMINED BY A REPRESENTATIVE SCHOOL/COMMUNITY COMMITTEE, JUNE 1975

Fourth Ranked School Goal:

4. Develop a Desire for Learning Now and In the Future.

GROUP	SCORE	MEAN	LEVEL OF RESPONSIBILITY*
Parents	4.8		High
Teachers	4.7		High
Students	4.4		High
Principal	4.3		High
Central Administration	3.7	3.6	Medium
Regional Administration	3.3		Medium
School Board	2.9		Slight
Other Citizens	2.9		Slight
City Government	2.8		Slight
Congress	2.3		Slight

*A score of 5 = very high responsibility; 4 = high responsibility; 3 = medium responsibility; 2 = slight responsibility; 1 = no responsibility.

The fourth ranked goal lists parents, teachers, students, and principals as having a high level of responsibility for promoting the student's desire for learning now and in the future. It is interesting that parents scored slightly above teachers and others in this group, underscoring the importance of the home environment in the promotion of this goal. The scores also show, as in the case of other important goals, the belief that home and school are partners in this process. The central administration, with a medium responsibility, also scored above the mean.

Below the mean lie five groups. Four of these groups, the School Board, other citizens, the city government, and Congress, respectively, are shown as having slight responsibility for achieving this goal. The fifth group, regional administration, is listed as having medium responsibility.

TABLE XIII

LEVEL OF RESPONSIBILITY FOR ATTAINING THE FIFTH RANKED LOCAL SCHOOL GOAL AS DETERMINED BY A REPRESENTATIVE SCHOOL/COMMUNITY COMMITTEE, JUNE 1975

Fifth Ranked School Goal:

5. Learn to Respect and Get Along With People With Whom We Work and Live.

GROUP	SCORE	MEAN	LEVEL OF RESPONSIBILITY*
Parents	4.9		High
Teachers	4.9		High
Principal	4.8		High
Students	4.7		High
Other Citizens	3.8	3.7	Medium
School Board	3.1		Medium
Central Administration	3.0		Medium
Regional Administration	2.8		Slight
City Government	2.6		Slight
Congress	2.3		Slight

*A score of 5 = very high responsibility; 4 = high responsibility; 3 = medium responsibility; 2 = slight responsibility; 1 = no responsibility.

In this table, five groups are shown above the mean. The top four of these groups have been assigned high levels of responsibility. Among these, parents and teachers have been assigned equal high scores of 4.9. Slightly lower scores and still within high responsibility range, were assigned to the principal and students. The category "other citizens" is next above the mean with a medium level of responsibility.

Below the mean lie the remaining five groups. Two of these groups, the School Board and Central Administration, are designated with medium levels of responsibility, while the remaining three, the Regional Administration, City Government, and Congress, are shown with slight responsibility.

IV. CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTED USE OF DATA

Implemention of the "Shared Accountability" in one of the Regions in the D.C. Public Schools was successfully carried out in June, 1975. At the elementary school which participated, preliminary arrangements were made with the principal and the President of the Home and School Association. The Chairwoman of the Home and School Association School Budget Committee made the final arrangements. On June 5 and 10, 1975, representatives of the elementary school/community joined with representatives of the Office of Planning, Research and Evaluation, D.C. Public Schools, in the implementation of a model program for community and professional development in a three part shared accountability project.

The goals of the project were: 1) to assist schools to develop community ranked educational goals, 2) to assess needs, i.e. determine how well community ranked educational goals are being met, and 3) to determine who among a number of groups, are responsibile for carrying out the goals as viewed from the local school level. Representing the school at the first meeting were 17 individuals from the school/community, five teachers, nine parents and three sixth graders. Fourteen participated in the needs assessment exercise. At the second meeting, a total of 12 participated, the principal, five teachers, four parents and two sixth grade students. While there was some change in membership among participants due to conflicting engagements and assignments, a basic stable core of individuals participated in both sessions. Those who were new to the second session had been briefed by parents or teachers respectively.

Mr. Roger J. Fish of the Division of Research and Evaluation, assisted by Mrs. Veta Harrison of the same office, explained the purpose of the overall two session project including a brief description of planned activities. Session one's major activity involved the implementation of Phi Delta Kappa's model program for community and professional involvement. This activity was carried out by Dr. David A. Erlandson, School of Education, Queens College, City University of New York. Dr. Erlandson was asked to assist because of his extensive experience in implementing this program for Phi Delta Kappa.

The outcome of this first meeting was the establishment of a prioritized list of educational goals for the school. At the end of the meeting those present were also given an eighteen item instrument entitled "Individual Rating of the Level of Performance of Current School Programs". Participants were asked to complete these at home and to consult with others before making their response. The purpose of this exercise was to help determine how well current programs were meeting school goals. These forms were collected at the subsequent meeting. Specific results of each of the three part exercise are contained in Chapter Three of this report.

Less than a week later the second session was held at the school. The purpose of the meeting was 1) to determine how important each goal is, and 2) to determine who among a number of groups, were responsible

for carrying out the goals as viewed from the local school level. An instrument developed by the Division of Research and Evaluation was utilized for that purpose.

Valuable experience and information has also been gained from the process of implementation itself and new insights into the uses of the process. Two items were immediately evident 1) the process encourages participation within the school/community, stimulates discussion and helps build consensus on educational goals and promotes deeper understanding of the concept of shared responsibilities and therefore of shared accountability for student success in school, and 2) creates a momentum which can be channeled into a variety of follow-up activities such as a management plan to develop more efficient utilization of resources, an education plan embracing improvements in the instructional program, instructional and curriculum revision, staff development activities, and the initial phase of a comprehensive educational plan at the regional or state level.

APPENDIX A

Kappans Ponder the Goals of Education

By Harold Spears

Phi Delta Kappan
Sept. 1973
Vol. LV No. 1

In a list of 18 goals of education, Phi Delta Kappans endorse the development of skills in reading, writing, speaking, and listening as number one. By contrast, they rate the proper management of money, property, and resources as fourteenth in importance, and health and safety as fifteenth. Their views on the other goals are treated later in this article, and the complete poll is presented at the end.

Within the past year PDK has become involved in one of the most extensive and systematized educational goal searches ever launched in American education. Originating with the Program Development Center at the California State University, Chico, the program now constitutes a model for community and school involvement.

Phi Delta Kappa took over distribution of the model, which consists of structured materials for school district use, in April, 1972. A year later, in May, 1973, a three-day conference at the international headquarters of PDK in Bloomington, Indiana, involved 60 representatives from 22 colleges and universities from coast to coast, selected as affiliated training institutions. These institutions will act as service centers for school districts within their areas wishing to engage in this intensive goal-searching experience.

It has been estimated that since the PDK kickoff in April, 1972, over 5,000 educators have attended 100 workshops, and over 30,000 citizens, 16,000 professionals, and 40,000 students have already been involved in the discussion and ranking of the aims of formal schooling.

A standard feature of the program, the take-off for a school district's more meticulous study of its objectives, is the group reaction to a basic list of 18 goals of the common public school, from first grade and possibly kindergarten up through high school graduation — or to dropout.

This goals list was the basis of the poll of *Kappan* opinion reported here. Each respondent was asked to rank the 18 goals according to his own convictions. The instrument was also given to the 60 college representatives at the conference mentioned above, and their reactions are also carried at the end of this article. The similarity of judgment between the two groups would indicate a common conditioning that we as educators evidently receive somewhere along the line.

In reporting this current extensive search for the justification of school practice, it seems proper to place it in context with past excursions into this theoretical thicket. The approach will reflect my undergraduate major in history and my doctorate in curriculum.

Stating the objectives of education is no doubt as old as the establishment of a roof over a teacher's head. (Perhaps such a school as Socrates operated out in the open was without the aid of such a guide.) At least from its New England beginnings, the trail of American education is strewn with the good intentions of both the schools' providers and their practitioners.

For instance, we can recall Benjamin Franklin's disgust with the Latin grammar school and his 1743 *Proposals Relating to the Education of Youth in Pennsylvania*, which led to the establishment of the first academy in Philadelphia in 1751:

> As to their studies it would be well if they could be taught everything that is useful, and everything that is ornamental. But art is long and their time is short. It is therefore proposed that they learn those things that are likely to be most useful and more ornamental; regard being had to the several professions for which they are intended.[1]

Noticeable in Franklin's intent was "the training of our Natives to bear Magistracies, and execute other public offices of trust," and "a number of the poorer Sort will be hereby qualified to act as Schoolmasters." Objectives? Yes, and an indication of the forerunner of ability grouping.

Perhaps one of the two most intensive and protracted periods of goal setting in American education was that instigated by the famous Kalamazoo court case of 1874, which legalized public secondary education as a natural and legitimate extension of the eight-year common school.

The National Education Association, which in those olden days mothered administrators as well as teachers and recognized pickets as merely something stationary on a school fence, spent its funds on a highly respected series of seven national committees and commissions between 1892 and 1918. These bodies dissected purposes and proposed practices for the secondary school, which of course required adjustments in the lower grades.[2]

Perhaps the most profound achievement of this period was the curriculum recommendation of the final commission, the Seven Cardinal Principles of Secondary Education:

1. Health	(15)
2. Command of fundamental processes	(1)
3. Worthy home membership	(12)

HAROLD SPEARS (Columbia University Chapter) is a consultant to schools, based at Indiana University, where he has served as visiting professor of educational administration. This is the last in a series of four opinion polls he is directing for Phi Delta Kappa. The polls are intended to guide Phi Delta Kappa leaders in taking stands on important educational issues.

32

4. Vocation (16)
5. Civic education (8)
6. Worthy use of leisure (17)
7. Ethical character (3)

It is interesting that these seven goals are all found among the 18 that constitute the basis of the POK opinion poll we are treating here, but still more interesting is the rating they now receive. In each case, the rank assigned by Kappans appears at the right in the above list.

How does the *public* response to the goals question compare with the reaction of professionals reported here? Attention is called to the Fourth Annual Gallup Poll of Public Attitudes Toward Education, conducted last year.[3] Gallup's question was:

> People have different reasons why they want their children to get an education. What are the chief reasons that come to your mind?

After the person interviewed had answered, he was asked if he could think of anything else. One further attempt was made to see if he could add to the list. Here are the responses and the percentage of respondents mentioning each in some form:

1. To get a better job 44%
2. To get along better with people of all levels of society 43%
3. To make more money — to achieve financial success 38%
4. To attain self-satisfaction 21%
5. To stimulate their minds 15%
6. Miscellaneous reasons 11%

Note that in the Gallup technique there were no suggestions — no projected list — to which the layman could respond. Off the top of their heads, two of every five mentioned preparation for jobs and approximately the same percentage thought of the school as the means to greater financial success. Gallup commented that "this heavy emphasis on material goals, at the expense of those concerned with intellectual and artistic development, should come as no shock. Americans are a practical people who believe firmly that education is the royal road to success in life."

In contrast to this public attitude, Kappans rate job preparation sixteenth in a list of 18 school goals, and job counseling only thirteenth.

I believe that the second intensive period of goal setting in our education history came with establishment of the position of curriculum director. Beyond a doubt, in man's creation of schools, subjects preceded formalized statements of educational objectives, and systematic goal setting was reared by — if not exactly born of — curriculum directors. Perhaps it was Teachers College, Columbia, that determined by about 1930 that a curriculum director should be standard equipment in a school district of significant size, the definition of "significant" being left to local pride and revenue.

And in turn, in 1934 Superintendent Ralph Irons of Evansville, Indiana, established the position and moved me over as director. This experience can be taken as typical of the curriculum approach that swept the country in that decade. Systematically, field by field, our Evansville curriculum revision was preceded by carefully determined objectives, such as an overall guide to subject revision in the social studies field:

1. To build within the pupil a national patriotism and a desire to maintain the democratic standards of our national life.
2. To instill in the pupil appreciation of his rights, duties, privileges, and responsibilities as a citizen.
3. To acquaint the pupil with the communities of which he is a part, their conditions, and their problems.
4. To impress the pupil with the necessity of cooperative effort in this world of increasing interdependence.
5. To develop within the pupil a loyalty for our basic institutions, with the understanding that they must be adjusted to changing conditions.
6. To train the pupil to select and weigh evidence with an open mind, so that he will think through social situations with truth as a goal.
7. To cultivate on the part of the pupil tolerance and a friendly attitude toward the customs, ideals, and traditions of other peoples.
8. To impress the pupil with his indebtedness to other people — past and present — in order to stimulate him to make his own contribution to progressing society.
9. To broaden and enrich the pupil's life through the awakening and growth of cultural interests.
10. To help the pupil to acquire the habit of considering the historical background of a current problem in attempting to solve it.
11. To encourage the pupil to acquire the habit of reading extensively concerning social affairs.
12. To give the pupil an understanding of the economic system of which he is a part, and to help him find a place in it for himself.[4]

As I look back, I wonder how we could ever have reached such ideals with pupils through the formal classroom assign-study-recite and write-a-paper approach that still so largely constitutes school.

This is the fourth and last poll in the series that it has been my privilege to conduct for Phi Delta Kappa, the others covering the school racial issue, financing education, and current instructional and school management practices.

In developing the first three questionnaires, I naturally had a mind-set on a number of the items, satisfying both curiosity and ego in checking others' reactions. Since this fourth instrument is not a personal creation, I assume it is the reporter's prerogative to take the poll himself, and in doing so to limit the task to seven picks as a group rather than in rank order. For instance:

Learn how to be a good citizen.
Develop skills to enter a specific field of work.
Learn how to be a good manager of money, property, and resources.
Understand and practice the skills of family living.
Practice and understand the ideas of health and safety.
Learn to respect and get along with people.
Learn how to use leisure time.

I may have flunked the course, but in rebuttal I should point out that this selection is not a denial of the importance of the skills in reading, writing, speaking, mathematics, and such. Rather, it considers them, as well as

social studies and other subjects and school activities, as a means of reaching broader goals such as the seven above, goals that have a lifetime focus for the student rather than the more limited school focus.

It may have been the combination of an early disillusionment with the subject curriculum, and an extended experience in our profession of trying to apply it in school administration, that has brought me to this position. Namely, to the conclusion that school subjects – cut up in semester or yearly bits – are not ends in themselves, even though the system of marking, failure, and promotion that has carried down from the past century would elevate them to such prominence.

The discussion of educational goals and objectives will no doubt continue the popularity it has held with both the public and the professionals since Franklin's time, and rightfully so. But the test of the effort will be in moving it over from a pasttime, an end in itself, into significant revision of school practice to serve the goal intent.

In order to reach their high goals, tillers in the field of school objectives may well have to transform the basic structure of the school and discharge a number of her attending handmaidens who were sired by that renegade, atomistic psychology, long since exposed as a shyster.

If I have raised any doubts about the ease of moving a school system from sound objectives to sound practices, it reflects the confessions of an early apostle of *The Emerging High School Curriculum,*[3] which never emerged beyond the covers in which it was so tightly bound by the publishers, and *The High School for Today,*[4] which in its orbit never actually shed yesterday's nose-cone.

The test of any list of school objectives, such as the 18 goals in question or all those penned in the past, is not in final agreement on their relative worth by the framers but rather in the attempt to apply them to the school setting.

Take for instance the second choice of the Kappans on the list of 18: "Develop pride in work and a feeling of self-worth." In this period of compulsory school attendance to age 16 or 18, it has long since been established that for a significant fraction of the typical student body neither the reading of a page nor the writing of one is the avenue to a feeling of "positive self-worth, security, and self-assurance." In fact, there may be a negative affect.

In this POK-sponsored program, exciting will be the school district that recognizes such a fact and, with the support of the extensive enterprises that make up the life of a busy community, broadens the learning experience beyond the premises of the school plant. In seeking consultant help, such school districts might naturally look first to the 22 colleges and universities mentioned earlier as launching pads of innovation. The systematized goal study materials might be the second source of inspiration.

There was something about the results of this present poll that brought to mind a piece I once ran across in a book, *Principles of Education,* written by two of my Columbia professors, J. C. Chapman and George Counts, 50 years ago. It went like this:

Greeting his pupils, the master asked,
What would you learn of me?
And the reply came:
How shall we care for our bodies?
How shall we rear our children?
How shall we work together?
How shall we live with our fellow men?
How shall we play?
For what ends shall we live?
And the teacher pondered these words, and sorrow was in his heart, for his own learning touched not these things.

---

1. Harold Spears, *Secondary Education in American Life* (New York: American Book Co., 1941).
2. Op. cit., pp. 304-18.
3. *Phi Delta Kappan,* September, 1972, pp. 33-46.
4. Harold Spears, *Experiences in Building a Curriculum* (New York: MacMillan, 1937), pp. 67, 68.
5. American Book Company, 1940.
6. Greenwood Press, Westport, Conn. (republished in 1971).

Opinionnaire Responses

The 18 goals of education listed in the POK opinionnaire are rearranged here in order of importance, as rated by Kappans in the field.

Figures in the right-hand column indicate the rank assigned each goal by the 60 representatives of cooperating college centers who attended the POK goals conference in May, 1973 (see above). In this case, because of ties, two 8s and two 10s are shown, with no 9 or 11.

The Goals of Education

1.	Develop skills in reading, writing, speaking, and listening. A. Develop ability to communicate ideas and feelings effectively. B. Develop skills in oral and written English.	1
2.	Develop pride in work and a feeling of self-worth. A. Develop a feeling of student pride in his achievements and progress. B. Develop self-understanding and self-awareness. C. Develop the student's feeling of positive self-worth, security, and self-assurance.	2
3.	Develop good character and self-respect. A. Develop moral responsibility and a sound ethical and moral behavior. B. Develop the student's capacity to discipline himself to work, study, and play constructively. C. Develop a moral and ethical sense of values, goals, and processes of free society. D. Develop standards of personal character and ideas.	8
4.	Develop a desire for learning now and in the future. A. Develop intellectual curiosity and eagerness for lifelong learning. B. Develop a positive attitude toward learning. C. Develop a positive attitude toward continuing independent education.	3
5.	Learn to respect and get along with people with whom we work and live. A. Develop appreciation and respect for the worth and dignity of individuals. B. Develop respect for individual worth and understanding of minority opinions and acceptance of majority decisions. C. Develop a cooperative attitude toward living and working with others.	5

6. Learn how to examine and use information. 4
   A. Develop ability to examine constructively and creatively.
   B. Develop ability to use scientific methods.
   C. Develop reasoning abilities.
   D. Develop skills to think and proceed logically.

7. Gain a general education. 6
   A. Develop background and skills in the use of numbers, natural sciences, mathematics, and social sciences.
   B. Develop a fund of information and concepts.
   C. Develop special interests and abilities.

8. Learn how to be a good citizen. 8
   A. Develop an awareness of civic rights and responsibilities.
   B. Develop attitudes for productive citizenship in a democracy.
   C. Develop an attitude of respect for personal and public property.
   D. Develop an understanding of the obligations and responsibilities of citizenship.

9. Learn about and try to understand the changes that take place in the world. 10
   A. Develop ability to adjust to the changing demands of society.
   B. Develop an awareness and the ability to adjust to a changing world and its problems.
   C. Develop understanding of the past, identity with the present, and ability to meet the future.

10. Understand and practice democratic ideas and ideals. 13
   A. Develop loyalty to American democratic ideals.
   B. Develop patriotism and loyalty to ideas of democracy.
   C. Develop knowledge and appreciation of the rights and privileges in our democracy.
   D. Develop an understanding of our American heritage.

11. Learn how to respect and get along with people who think, dress, and act differently. 7
   A. Develop an appreciation for and an understanding of other people and other cultures.
   B. Develop an understanding of political, economic, and social patterns of the rest of the world.
   C. Develop awareness of the interdependence of races, creeds, nations, and cultures.
   D. Develop an awareness of the processes of group relationships.

12. Understand and practice the skills of family living. 16
   A. Develop understanding and appreciation of the principles of living in the family group.
   B. Develop attitudes leading to acceptance of responsibilities as family members.
   C. Develop an awareness of future family responsibilities and achievement of skills in preparing to accept them.

13. Gain information needed to make job selections. 17
   A. Promote self-understanding and self-direction in relation to students' occupational interests.
   B. Develop the ability to use information and counseling services related to the selection of a job.
   C. Develop a knowledge of specific information about a particular vocation.

14. Learn how to be a good manager of money, property, and resources. 15
   A. Develop an understanding of economic principles and responsibilities.
   B. Develop ability and understanding in personal buying, selling, and investment.
   C. Develop skills in management of natural and human resources and man's environment.

15. Practice and understand the ideas of health and safety. 12
   A. Establish an effective individual physical fitness program.
   B. Develop an understanding of good physical health and well-being.
   C. Establish sound personal health habits and information.
   D. Develop a concern for public health and safety.

16. Develop skills to enter a specific field of work. 18
   A. Develop abilities and skills needed for immediate employment.
   B. Develop an awareness of opportunities and requirements related to a specific field of work.
   C. Develop an appreciation of good workmanship.

17. Learn how to use leisure time. 14
   A. Develop ability to use leisure time productively.
   B. Develop a positive attitude toward participation, in a range of leisure time activities — physical, intellectual, and creative.
   C. Develop appreciation and interests which will lead to wise and enjoyable use of leisure time.

18. Appreciate culture and beauty in the world. 10
   A. Develop abilities for effective expression of ideas and cultural appreciation (fine arts).
   B. Cultivate appreciation for beauty in various forms.
   C. Develop creative self-expression through various media (art, music, writing, etc.).
   D. Develop special talents in music, art, literature, and foreign languages.

35

Opinionnaire Procedures

A random sample of 1,020 Phi Delta Kappans was drawn by computer from the PDK active membership master file of 97,920 names. The ratio of 745 campus chapter members to 275 field chapter members was the same 3 to 1 ratio found in the total PDK population. Number of years of paid membership was also checked.

The sample includes individuals born prior to 1900 and as recently as the 1945-49 period, the median age being 40. One-quarter are 47 years of age or older and one-quarter are between ages 22 and 35. All other Kappans are in the middle group, 36-46.

The responses from 609 usable returns (60%) were coded and punched on data cards. Characteristics of the respondents were compared with those of the total sample on several variables, including age and type and length of PDK affiliation. Distributions for the respondents and for the sample were almost identical, leading to the inference that the respondents do not differ markedly from nonrespondents in other respects.

Geographic distribution of the respondents was compared with that of the total membership. In only two cases were states identified in which the proportions differed by more than a single percentage point, and in these two cases it was less than two percentage points. It can be concluded that a no-response bias does not exist and that the findings of this opinion survey can be generalized to the total Phi Delta Kappa population.

GOAL STATEMENT	1	2	3	4	5
LEARN TO RESPECT AND GET ALONG WITH PEOPLE WITH WHOM WE WORK AND LIVE A. Develop appreciation and respect for the worth and dignity of individuals. B. Develop respect for individual worth and understanding of minority opinions and acceptance of majority decisions. C. Develop a cooperative attitude toward living and working with others.	●				
DEVELOP SKILLS IN READING, WRITING, SPEAKING AND LISTENING A. Develop ability to communicate ideas and feelings effectively. B. Develop skills in oral and written English.	●	●	●	●	●
UNDERSTAND AND PRACTICE THE SKILLS OF FAMILY LIVING A. Develop understanding and appreciation of the principles of living in the family group. B. Develop attitudes leading to acceptance of responsibilities as family members. C. Develop an awareness of future family responsibilities and achievement of skills in preparing to accept them.	●	●			
DEVELOP SKILLS TO ENTER A SPECIFIC FIELD OF WORK A. Develop abilities and skills needed for immediate employment. B. Develop an awareness of opportunities and requirements related to a specific field of work. C. Develop an appreciation of good workmanship.	●	●	●		
DEVELOP PRIDE IN WORK AND A FEELING OF SELF-WORTH A. Develop a feeling of student pride in his achievements and progress. B. Develop self-understanding and self-awareness. C. Develop the student's feeling of positive self-worth, security, and self-assurance.	●	●	●	●	
LEARN HOW TO EXAMINE AND USE INFORMATION A. Develop ability to examine constructively and creatively. B. Develop ability to use scientific methods. C. Develop reasoning abilities. D. Develop skills to think and proceed logically.	●	●			

Remember to transfer your score to the Summary Sheet.

APPENDIX C

A QUESTIONNAIRE TO DETERMINE WHO IS RESPONSIBILE FOR WHAT IN PUBLIC EDUCATION

Instructions:

For each of the educational goals listed on the left side of the following page, please indicate: (1) how important you think the goal is and (2) how much responsibility you think each group should have in carrying out the goal. Please assign a rating of either 5, 4, 3, 2, or 1, as follows:

Importance of goal:

Enter 5 if the goal is of very high importance,
4 if the goal is of high importance,
3 if the goal is of medium importance,
2 if the goal is of slight importance,
1 if the goal is of no importance.

Responsibility for goal:

Enter 5 if the group should have very high responsibility,
4 if the group should accept high responsibility,
3 if the group should accept medium responsibility,
2 if the group should accept slight responsibility,
1 if the group should accept no responsibility.

Please remember that you are to indicate how much responsibility each of the groups are to have, including your own group.

An example of how to respond to an item is presented below:

EDUCATIONAL GOAL	HOW IMPORTANT IS THE GOAL?	TO WHAT DEGREE SHOULD EACH GROUP BE RESPONSIBILE FOR THE GOAL?									
		Principals	Students	Congress	School Board	Regional Administrators	Central Administrators	Teachers	Parents	Other Citizens	City Government
DEVELOP PRIDE IN WORK AND A FEELING OF SELF-WORTH	4	4	5	2	3	2	2	5	5	3	2

Instrument: Adopted from "A Questionnaire to Determine Who is Responsible for What in Public Education," State Department of Education, State of North Carolina, March 1975 and revised for use in the Public Schools of the District of Columbia.

Educational Goals: Adopted from "Educational Goals and Objectives: A Model Program for Community and Professional Involvement." Phi Delta Kappa.

APPENDIX D

A COMPARISON OF LOCAL SCHOOL GOALS IN RANK ORDER AND THE RATED IMPORTANCE OF EACH GOAL AS DETERMINED BY A REPRESENTATIVE SCHOOL/COMMUNITY COMMITTEE, JUNE 1975

GOALS IN RANK ORDER (Prioritized List)	RATED IMPORTANCE OF EACH GOAL *					Average Rated Score	Rounded Score
	1	2	3	4	5		
1. DEVELOP SKILLS IN READING, WRITING, SPEAKING AND LISTENING.					X	4.92	5
2. LEARN HOW TO EXAMINE AND USE INFORMATION					X	4.75	5
3. DEVELOP PRIDE IN WORK AND A FEELING OF SELF-WORTH.				X		4.17	4
4. DEVELOP A DESIRE FOR LEARNING NOW AND IN THE FUTURE.					X	4.92	5
5. LEARN TO RESPECT AND GET ALONG WITH PEOPLE WITH WHOM WE WORK AND LIVE.					X	4.92	5
6. DEVELOP GOOD CHARACTER AND SELF-RESPECT.				X		4.09	4
7. PRACTICE AND UNDERSTAND THE IDEAS OF HEALTH AND SAFETY.				X		4.34	4
8. GAIN A GENERAL EDUCATION.			X			3.17	3
8. LEARN ABOUT AND TRY TO UNDERSTAND THE CHANGES THAT TAKE PLACE IN THE WORLD.					X	4.59	5
8. LEARN HOW TO RESPECT AND GET ALONG WITH PEOPLE WHO THINK, DRESS AND ACT DIFFERENTLY.				X		3.67	4
11. APPRECIATE CULTURE AND BEAUTY IN THE WORLD.				X		4.33	4
12. LEARN HOW TO BE A GOOD CITIZEN.				X		3.92	4
13. LEARN HOW TO USE LEISURE TIME.				X		4.17	4
13. UNDERSTAND AND PRACTICE DEMOCRATIC IDEAS AND IDEALS.				X		4.06	4
15. LEARN HOW TO BE A GOOD MANAGER OF MONEY, PROPERTY AND RESOURCES.		X				3.50	4
16. UNDERSTAND AND PRACTICE THE SKILLS OF FAMILY LIVING.		X				2.25	2
17. DEVELOP SKILLS TO ENTER A SPECIFIC FIELD OF WORK.		X				2.42	2
17. GAIN INFORMATION NEEDED TO MAKE JOB SELECTIONS.		X				1.67	2
						1.75	2

*A score of 5 = very high importance; 4 = high importance; 3 = medium importance; 2 = slight importance; 1 = no importance.